

NEW YORK
HERALD TRIBUNE

MAR 3 0 1964

STATINTL

STATINTL

*Today in World Affairs***Other Side of Fulbright Thesis**By David Lawrence
WASHINGTON.

President Johnson, wisely though belatedly, decided to let it be known on Saturday that the speech last Wednesday by Sen. J. W. Fulbright, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, must not be regarded abroad as the viewpoint and policy of the United States.

Although there had been previous intimations from the White House that Mr. Fulbright expressed solely his own views, much of the press of France and Great Britain promptly interpreted the speech as meaning that America not only might stop bothering about Cuba but eventually would recognize Red China—all this because it is supposed to be the "practical" thing to do in these days of what the Arkansas Senator describes as a recognition of "new realities."

French officials immediately called this "Gaullism," especially the Senator's suggestions about opening the door to Communist China. But Secretary of State Rusk, at a news conference two days after the Fulbright speech was delivered, negated the idea that the Administration policy of economic isolation of Cuba has been a "failure," as charged by the Arkansas Senator. The Secretary said that he thought the Senator "underestimates the co-operation the free-world countries have given" in this matter. He also stated that there is no intention in the near future to recognize the Peking government.

Several Democrats as well as Republicans in Congress severely criticized the Fulbright speech, but there is no doubt that he reflects a view prevailing among many of the so-called liberals in and out of Congress.

Mr. Fulbright has insisted that he is not condemning the use of the boycott against Cuba but is merely arguing that the U. S. must concede it has failed to make such a policy effective. He recommends that the U. S. should "come to terms, at last, with the realities of a world in which neither good nor evil is absolute and in which those who move events and make history are those who have understood not how much but how little it is within our power to change."

This point of view has come as a surprise because it is a contradiction of fundamental American principles and beliefs in the power of moral force—in disregard of material expediency—to affect the destinies of mankind. What Mr. Fulbright says, in effect, is that "everybody is doing it, so why not do it, too?" He refers, for example, to the recent American wheat deal with the Communist regime in Moscow, and says:

"Our efforts to persuade our Allies to terminate their trade with Cuba have been generally rebuffed. The prevailing attitude was perhaps best expressed by a British manufacturer who, in response to American criticisms of the sale of British buses to Cuba, said: 'If America has a surplus of wheat, we have a surplus of buses.'"

But although the wheat deal was approved by the Kennedy administration and continued by President Johnson, it has yet to be demonstrated that the American people really believe that the U. S. should have sold wheat to the Soviet Union. The action was not necessarily endorsed just because it was authorized by the Administration here. All this is reminiscent of the 1930s, when the cry was heard that "you can do business with Hitler."

Sen. Fulbright argues that he is not "against the desirability of an economic boycott against the Castro regime but against its feasibility." He notes merely that the effort has been made and that the U. S. should admit and concede that the boycott policy has been a "failure." But defenders of the boycott idea assert that it has not as yet been given a chance. There is no clear evidence that the U. S. government, for instance, has exerted any real pressure on its Western allies, or that it has made an issue with Moscow over the continued help given to Castro

or the building-up of a military base there, from which subversive units are being sent into different parts of Latin America.

Only recently the Organization of American States made public its proof that the effort to overthrow the government of Venezuela had originated in Communist Cuba. But nothing has been done to restrain Castro by means of "collective defense" through the OAS—on which Mr. Fulbright would rely to combat subversion and infiltration.

Cuba today remains, moreover, an example to the whole world of how a military dictatorship, aided and abetted by the Soviet government, can deprive millions of people of their liberty. While Sen. Fulbright is willing to dismiss Castro as a "distasteful nuisance," Secretary Rusk has told the press that the Cuban dictator "is more than a nuisance—he is a threat to the hemisphere."

Although, as Sen. Fulbright says, the U. S. is not "omnipotent," it is also a fact that the U. S. is not without considerable influence and power in the world. It has granted billions of dollars in foreign aid and has helped to resuscitate the economic life of Europe and other areas. It has sacrificed the lives of its own soldiers and sailors in three major wars in the last half-century over 3,000 miles away from our territory. To imply that the U. S. has no influence any more to bring about an economic boycott in a righteous cause is to suggest that one of the most important weapons that can be used to prevent war is no longer of value and should be abandoned.

© 1964, New York Herald Tribune Inc.